

JX  
1963  
N3  
722

# STUDENTS FIGHT WAR



Published by  
**NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE**  
Five Cents



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK  
PARK AVENUE AND 59TH ST.

September 18, 1918.

To Principals of High Schools:

All the material in Chapters I-VII of the accompanying High School Syllabus of the World War should be taught during the term ending January 31st, 1919, in the most efficient and inspiring manner, to all the pupils in your school. Notice will be sent later in reference to the teaching of this subject during subsequent terms.

I leave to your judgment the determination of the amount of time to be devoted to this subject and the teachers by whom it is to be taught.

Opportunity should be afforded for reproduction of the subject matter by pupils as well as for presentation by the teacher. The subject matter included in this syllabus may be supplemented by additional data as the war progresses. All such material, however, should be approved by the Principal of the school before it is used in the classroom.

In addition to imparting a correct intellectual understanding of the causes, events and issues of the war, our teachers should inspire the pupils with a love for the ideals and an appreciation of the sacrifices of our country. The American Army of the future, both men and women, are in our schools to-day. Never before have our teachers had so grave a responsibility or so wonderful an opportunity.

"History should be taught so that a deep emotional appeal shall be made in all topics. A lasting effect can be produced on the ideals, purposes and emotions of the child only by arousing deep feeling in connection with the presentation of the subject matter. Whenever possible the emotional appeal should be positive by citing illustrations of the wonderful progress of our country, the courage and moral character of our great men and the patriotism and sacrifices of the people in time of war."  
(Page 17, Syllabus in History and Civics, for use in the Elementary Schools)

*W. R. Livingston*  
Superintendent of Schools

## STUDENTS FIGHT WAR

OPPOSITION to war on the American campus is not new. Sporadic outbursts of objection to military training have occurred here and there. Spontaneous movements protesting war preparations have arisen from time to time but without a sense of direction. What is significant in the present anti-war movement is its breadth, the character of its action, its program.

The twenty-five thousand students who answered the strike call on April 13, 1934, pledged never to support the United States government in any war it may conduct. Student conferences have pointed out that war is fomented by the hunt for markets, by the scramble for profits, by the inexorable workings of our present economic system. Resolutions have stressed the connection between fascism and war, that fascism drives nations to war at a quickened speed. Our resolutions have hailed the peace policies of the Soviet Union. They have called for the abolition of the R.O.T.C. because it is an arm of the war department. They have prescribed cooperation with the basic force in the anti-war movement, the working class.

In brief, student opposition to war has become realistic. Anti-war conferences have planned immediate actions simultaneously, pointing out root causes.

Three important factors have determined the trend of the anti-war movement:

First, the economic crisis has forced students to re-examine traditional values and to look deeply into fundamental problems. Ninety-five per cent of the architects are unemployed; ninety per cent of the engineers, and seventy per cent of the chemists. Two hundred and fifty thousand teachers and five thousand college instructors are without jobs. Students, when they can complete their course of study, face the embittering prospect of never being able to practice their specialized skills. Shaken by the war danger they have sought the causes of war and have in-



dicted the same economic system which has shattered their ambitions and hope for economic security.

Second, the respectable pacifist movements have confessed their own bankruptcy. Organizations like the Carnegie Peace Foundation are endowed by fortunes accrued through war profits. At worst they have actually fostered and engendered imperialist schemes. Pacifism collapsed at the outbreak of the World War. We must look elsewhere if we seriously intend to stop war.

Third, the general dissatisfaction of students has found organizational and programmatic expression in the National Student League. The National Student League has been the leading spirit in the organization and militancy of the student anti-war movement as well as the medium responsible for the almost uniform comprehensiveness of its program.

It is appropriate that the first pamphlet outlining the aims and activities of the students' anti-war movement should be issued by the National Student League.

#### The Student in the World War

The last war saw the University the most efficient of war machines. Overnight the domain of "objective truth" was converted into a huge military camp where lethal poisons were manufactured by eminent chemists, where more subtle poisons were prepared for the edification of young soldiers, where those who could not bear arms were trained as auxiliaries. What an incongruous transformation! On one day there were erudite lectures on the beauties of the classics, on the future glories to be attained by humanity as a result of scientific achievement. The next was marked by harangues on the moral turpitude of the enemy, by rifle and bayonet practice. The trustees had to be served.

In a book\* dealing with the work of the Y.M.C.A. and the student volunteer movement of 1914-1918, we may glean an account of the technique in mobilizing students. The book under

\* J. R. Mott, *For the Millions of Men Now Under Arms*.

consideration was compiled by the Right Honorable John R. Mott, who writes in the preface, "It is earnestly requested that none of this material be reprinted in public." It is with the deepest regret that we violate Dr. Mott's confidence.

In Germany, at the beginning of the war, Dr. Mott organized a Deutsche Christliche Studenten Vereinigung. The first task this organization undertook was the publication of a Christmas book (Deutsche Weihnacht) to be mailed to all German students participating in the war as a "love gift." It was mailed to 45,000 students and "one may imagine the wave of brotherly love that flows back and forth, prompting the hearts at home and stirring the emotions of our university men in the ranks of the armies." The content and plan of the book are extremely gratifying, containing pithy remarks by men from all walks of life from philologists to counts. "Some of the contributions are so short that they may be read between the explosions of two English shells."

The touching solicitude of the German Students' Federation did not put the Austrian Movement to shame. "Of the Vienna University alone, 7,000 students were mobilized. . . ." Fortnightly bulletins were issued by the Student Movement in Vienna to 12,000 students in the trenches. They dealt with "the problem of suffering, moral problems, especially the problem of vice". The major articles were written by prominent professors. Another gift of the Austrian movement was even more effective in cheering the hearts of warrior-students. It was a volume called *Light in Darkness*, which contained illuminating treatises on the subject of "Light of Truth", "Light of Love", "Light of Life".

English and French students also joined hands in this singular Student Federation.

And while men were blowing one another up for God and country, the American bankers and munition makers enjoyed the fruits of a neutral capitalist power. The German armies were harassing the Allies with great discomfort to our bankers who had loans of twenty billions at stake. Walter Hines Page, United States Ambassador to Great Britain, cabled President



Wilson, March 5: "The pressure of this approaching crisis . . . has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan financial agency for the British and French governments. . . . It is not improbable that the only way of maintaining our present pre-eminent trade position and averting a panic is by declaring war on Germany." The time had come when it was imperative to realize that "the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts, for democracy . . . for a universal domination of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free". (From Wilson's War Address to Congress, April 2, 1917.)

The United States with its model efficiency immediately involved every conceivable resource in the building of its war machine. Under the supervision of the War Department, a committee on Education and Special Training set up a Student Army Training Corps according to the Selective Service Act of August, 1918. The object of the Corps was "to utilize the organization of colleges for selecting and training officer-candidates and technical experts for service in our existing emergency". The curriculum was divided into three main heads. First, instruction was given in military science. Then came the "allied" subjects such as physics, chemistry, geology, surveying, economics, international law, military law, applied psychology and government. Finally an indispensable course in war issues.

The actual working of this program may be best exemplified by the case of Columbia University.\*

The instructors who did not volunteer their services overseas devoted their talents to the formation of a Student Army Training Corps on the campus. Columbia was not content merely to accept the plan outlined above; the university authorities enthusiastically elaborated upon it. A naval gas engine school, a radio air service school, a school of photography, a naval section, and a United States war hospital were estab-

\* *Columbia War Work*—a pamphlet.

lished. Hartley and Livingston dormitories were used as barracks and mess halls. Officers were quartered in fraternity houses. On the Library steps where, on April 13, 1934, 2,000 students and instructors pledged "never to support the United States government in any war it may undertake", the entire student body on October 1, 1918, took the oath of allegiance to the flag in a delirious gesture of faith and loyalty.

Seventy-two instructors dedicated their services to the government; twenty-four professors from the medical school entered the Medical Service; five from the chemistry department joined the Gas Service Corps. From the engineering department seven professors joined the engineers. John Erskine directed the Educational Department of the Y.W.C.A. in France. Carlton J. H. Hayes engaged in "applicable" research. Harry L. Hollingworth investigated the mental fitness of soldiers (for the first time the Intelligence Quotient of the cannon fodder was of great importance). The other 36 found work in the particular application of their respective fields of specialization.

Dissenters were treated summarily. Professors James McKeon Cattell and Henry W. L. Dana by venturing to condemn the compulsory draft and criticize President Butler were found by the Board of Trustees to have ". . . done grave injury to the University by their public agitation against the war". The two world-famous scholars were expelled.

Columbia was not an isolated example. At Princeton by the fall of 1918 there were only sixty non-service men in college, twenty-seven of whom were physically disqualified for service, the remaining being under age.

Headlines appeared in the national press such as "Harvard Crew Disbanded—Rowing Goes by the Board as Call to War Is Heard", "Cornell Athletics Cease, Game Scheduled Cancelled Because of War," etc.

Even the girls' colleges were mobilized for the war machine. The courses offered were taught in their relation to the practical emergency. As an instance, the physics department at Wellesley offered wireless telegraphy, while the geology depart-



ment stressed mapmaking, and additional courses were given in nautical astronomy, home economics (work in soup kitchens), farm management, surgical dressings, occupational therapy.

The war economy penetrated to the heart of the campus. At Vassar, the Junior Proms were abolished. The Yearbook at Goucher was suspended. A system of wheatless and meatless days was observed at Mount Holyoke. Another college, notably Vassar, cared for gardens to supply the dormitory kitchens.

A campaign for war relief funds was carried on, a quota being set for each college. Thousands of girls were sent out to peddle Liberty Bonds. They became Red Cross maidens. They rolled bandages, and charming circles were organized to knit sweaters and pinafores for the infants of refugees. Numerous Florence Nightingales were shipped overseas.

In the New York high schools, a special syllabus was prepared by the Board of Education on the war, on patriotism and American ideals. High school students were inoculated with five official causes of the war:

1. The autocratic nature of the German government.
2. The character of the Kaiser.
3. The establishment by the German government of a mighty army and navy, and the growth of a powerful militaristic class.
4. The aspirations of the Germans to dominate the world.
5. The constant instilling into the minds of the German people of ideas which made them willing tools of their leaders.

And in the introductory paragraph to the chapter entitled "The U. S. in the World War" it declared, "Our teaching should inspire the pupils with the gigantic part America is planning to play, without desire to gain, except the gain resulting from the establishment of justice and fair dealing among the nations of the world".

This was our educational system of 1917-18, bent to the needs of the military, mobilized to serve the war-makers.

About 6,500 American students were killed in the nineteen months of the United States' participation. Tens of thousands were wounded. We were told, "The mood in which all was

borne was such as becometh the gentleman. The college man fought at Cambrai and Chateau-Thierry, and with determination, discrimination, and exultation. . . . He wore his crown of thorns, as one has said, as if it were cap and bells . . . free from the hate for his enemy, but determined to punish him for his ill-doings, serving his native land, yet remembering he was a soldier of humanity; true to the human brotherhood, yet not forgetting the divine Father." \* But we have heard it said since then ". . . the only way of maintaining our present pre-eminent trade position . . ." was to declare war on Germany. And when the armistice was signed there were 22,000 more millionaires in the United States.

#### The Nature of War and the War-Danger

It has been the habit of politicians, militarists, and some college professors to blame the war on the nature of man himself. In a "we hate to say it but it's true" tone they spring the antediluvian argument on us that the aggressive instinct which every man inherits makes war inevitable. Curiously enough, the present thesis is only served out during peace time. Apparently after war is declared the enemy retains the wicked biological urge which we immediately throw off in lieu of bigger and higher things. So in the last war, while the Germans were just being wolfish we were defending democracy, preserving civilization, etc. For the most part this argument has been enfeebled by the findings of scientific psychology and anthropology, and has been replaced by more "ingenious" causes for war.

Some time after the World War much public grumbling was heard from diplomats, historians, and others about the colossal impudence of some undersized, insignificant countries, specifically in the Balkans, which persisted in cutting capers, thereby embroiling the whole world. The gentlemen in question pointed their accusing fingers at these midgets with due self-righteousness; the countries were set down in history textbooks as incor-

\* Thwing, cf., *The American Colleges and Universities in the Great War*. New York, 1920.



rigible brats that required the watchful eye of the dignified real nations. The historians have never offered to explain just why the misbehavior of the Balkans brought world conflict in 1914. History cannot justify such absurdities.

Nor can the "greed of some nations" argument be acceptable, for, stated in these terms, we can be certain that greediness will always be characteristic of the opposing side.

Rather, greediness for sources of raw materials, for markets, is a natural property of every capitalist country and is not peculiar to any single one. To redivide the globe and to redistribute colonial markets is the battle cry of world imperialism.

With the expansion of home industry conflicting with the decreasing rate of profit, the need for further markets of capital investments becomes more pressing. But today the existing colonies are already gobbled up and exploited by competing powers. The conflict of imperialist powers for occupied world markets bring the development of new and ever more severe forms of economic warfare a step closer to actual warfare.

It follows that the solution of the economic crisis of capitalism—mass unemployment, mass impoverishment, the operation of great industrial enterprises at a fraction of their productive capacity—is sought for in war. The official theorists of Wall Street corroborate this analysis. "That there is a large possibility of a European war in the very near future can hardly be denied. We were lifted from a business depression in 1914 by the outbreak of a great war. It would be a curious repetition of function if another war should come to our industrial rescue." \*

But lifting the crisis of capitalism through war is a forlorn business as the last war proved. A business revival ensued. The present condition of the capitalist world, however, testifies to the short life of these revivals, that the disparity between production and buying power increases. Versailles could not erase the economic antagonisms which initiated a world slaughtering

\* *The Annalist*, New York, March 17, 1933.

adventure. It did not settle Germany. It did not delimit for evermore "the sphere of influence" of France and Italy. It did not consolidate permanently the position of imperialist Britain and the United States. It settled nothing. New antagonisms sprang up; since then alliances have been formed and reformed.

An imperialist war cannot solve the crisis; it can only hasten the advance of new wars.

Nevertheless, the imperialist powers are preparing for war now at a more rapid pace than prior to the outbreak of the first world war. France has surpassed her 1913 level of military expenditures by 25.8 per cent, Great Britain by 48.8 per cent, Italy by 2.3 per cent, the United States by 190.9 per cent, and Japan by 28.8 per cent. Germany, despite the restrictions placed on her war budget by the Treaty of Versailles, is within 43.3 per cent of her 1913 mark.\* The Roosevelt administration has inaugurated an era of unprecedented militarism through direct appropriation as well as indirect application of P.W.A. funds. (The President's proposed budget to the 74th Congress demands for national defense \$792,484,205 for 1936 as compared with an outlay of \$12,285,790 for 1935, and \$479,694,308 for 1934. "In addition to the regular appropriation for 1934 and 1935, the army and the navy have received more than \$373,000,000 from the Public Works Administration under the authority of the National Industrial Recovery Act.")

The upswing in the manufacture of arms has resulted in a boom for big business. In 1933, steel production in the United States was increased by 3,800,000 tons, of which only 1,000,000 were used for automobiles, canning, or building. It is not hard to trace the 2,800,000 tons to the munitions industry. Likewise in France the output of pig iron and steel rose 24 per cent, while the output of the engineering industry rose only 8 per cent. In Germany the output of steel increased 48 per cent, while the index of production in the engineering industry barely rose at all (from 34.2 to 39.5). So conspicuous was the increased out-

\* *Foreign Policy Reports*, November, 1934.



put in industries related to armaments that its effect loomed monstrous on the surface of the world economic crisis.

The great armament manufacturers, Krupp, Bethlehem Steel, the duPonts, England's Vickers-Armstrong, Schneider-Creusot (French), Czechoslovakia's Skoda (really French) win handsome returns on the imperialist rivalries which bring war. International in scope, they know no patriotism.

Vickers, besides its major plant in England, has its factories in Roumania, Italy, Spain, Japan, Canada, Ireland, Holland and New Zealand. The duPont corporation has an interest in such companies as South American Explosives, Italian Celluloid, French Duco, and the German I.G. Company. Schneider-Creusot controls 239 armament and allied enterprises outside France. Krupp gets the bulk of its business from South America and the Far East. It is clear how throughout the last war English and French industries maintained to Germany a steady stream of glycerin (for explosives), nickel, copper, oil and rubber; how Germany returned the compliment by sending France iron, steel, and magnetos for gasoline engines.

The alliance between armament makers and government apparatus can be seen in the instance when French munitions interests sold Hungary arms and Hungary defaulted on the bill. The French munitions makers suffered no anxiety about the intentions of the bad customer; they merely persuaded the French government to lend Hungary enough money to settle the bill. Thus, too, our State and War Departments have proved themselves to be more able munitions salesmen than the company's professionals. That munitions makers violate treaties when they sell their goods to many countries is not to be looked into—at least, not by the State Departments.\*

When a Senate investigating committee a few months back laid bare some of the salient facts relative to the activities of the American munitions industry, thinking people were staggered. The expose, considerably expurgated for the sake of the

\* Munitions Industry Hearings, September, 1934.

public's feelings and finally called off by the President, dismayed even the politicians on the committee, who are certainly well grounded in cynicism. Senator Nye got especially anxious. He proposed government ownership of the munitions industry as a guarantee against the pernicious machinations of the manufacturers and thereby sustaining peace. Similar proposals were made by hundreds of honest liberals. Everyone with the exception of the munitions makers and various governmental agencies were agreed that the scandalous situation warranted immediate action. But in their haste to find a solution those who favored governmental ownership fell into a fundamental error. They assumed that the intrigues of the munitions makers cause wars.

Munitions makers cause wars in the same sense that undertakers cause death. Neither is a cause; both are effects. War is an inherent device of capitalist society and the munitions industry comes in for a large share of the booty. True, they have often been able to prolong wars by bribing officials and exerting pressure upon high authorities. Yet, essentially, they are vultures who get their victim after the real damage is done. Government ownership of the munitions industry can only mean the conducting of war on a more efficient scale.

In all this, our liberals totally ignore the cardinal point. Whether the munitions industry is in the government's hands or privately owned does not minimize the danger of war itself. In either case the maintenance of peace rests with the workers both in the munitions industry and out—the extent of their organization against war, and with that of their allies—the students, technicians and farmers.

On the one hand, a tremendous spurt in armament industrial activity and, on the other, increased appropriations for war equipment, are clear indications of open preparation for war on the part of the imperialist powers. At the same time, in another realm of war preparations, we discern the internal political and economic crises of the capitalist countries resolving themselves in desperate nationalism, in external political rivalries, and in international alliances.



The advent of fascism in most countries of the world is eloquent evidence of the war danger. Because fascism is the most violent expression of broken-down capitalism it necessarily signifies war. With its suppression of all working class organizations and liberal and radical opinion, with its attempt to solve the problem of unemployment by means of the intensive militarization of labor in concentration camps, fascism is a direct part of capitalist war preparations. A stream of propaganda is set in motion to arouse extreme national chauvinism, and the minority nationalities suffer. The war psychology is created.

The spokesmen for German and Italian fascism frankly define the war-role of fascism. Mussolini states, "Fascism believes neither in the possibility nor the utility of perpetual peace. . . . War alone brings up to its highest tension all human energy and puts the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to meet it",\* and "Fascism provides the best form of political organization to meet the exigencies of war".\*\* Hitler chants, "In eternal warfare mankind has become great—in eternal peace mankind would be ruined".\*\*\*

But these marks of fascism are not peculiar to fascism alone; they are more or less common to all imperialist states.

England and the United States are already engaged in armed conflict fought vicariously by their South American holdings. Bolivia, controlled by Rockefeller interests' is battling with Paraguay (backed by British Royal Dutch Shell) over the sea outlet which Rockefeller needs for his Bolivian oil deposits.

The failure of the N.R.A. to solve the economic crisis in the United States has signalized the approach of imperialist conflict so unmistakably that the Roosevelt government is now a leading party in the race for war preparation. Over 12,000 factories have been inspected and approved by the War Department as ready to begin war production at a moment's notice.

\* Quoted in Dutt, *Fascism and Social Revolution*. International Publishers.

\*\* Quoted in the *New York Times*, November 11, 1934.

\*\*\* Hitler, *Mein Kampf*.

War preparations bills to purchase surplus copper, to establish new airplane flotillas, to build a "navy second to none", etc., are flooding Congress. The New Deal has done nothing but mobilize the nation for war.

Meanwhile the United States is clamping its iron heel on its colonies. The navy's trips to Cuba are made more frequent to insure the safety of the war-makers' investments. In Mexico political events are lined up to meet the demands of American oil barons. Our marines are kept in readiness to protect Rockefeller's interests in South America. In the Philippines strikes of impoverished workers are put down in blood. In China, American imperialism comes into sharp conflict with England and Japan.

Japanese imperialism makes no secret of its need for colonial expansion, at the expense of China and principally of the Soviet Union. In Japan's plan for a war against the Soviet Union it finds allies particularly in Germany and Poland, and generally in all the imperialist nations. Not only do these countries look to Soviet territory as a field for the colonial expansion without which they cannot maintain their present systems of exploitation, but primarily they see in the mounting strength and prestige of the Soviet Union a threat to their existence as representatives of decaying capitalism.

The anti-war movement, though it is growing by leaps and bounds, might appear to some as puny and quixotic in a world bristling with final preparations for war. Such underestimation of our efficacy is unwarranted in the face of the successes met with by vigorous opposition to war in the past. England's part in the War of Intervention (Siberia, 1919) was rudely interrupted by the actions of the English working class. Moreover, the movement possesses as an ally the most powerful of anti-war forces, the Soviet Union. The overthrow of capitalism in the Soviet Union means the extinction of the economic factors which make for war. There is no class in the Soviet Union that stands to profit by imperialist domination beyond its borders. Its all-absorbing concern is the establishment of a society free



from exploitation and classes, and guaranteeing security to the whole population. For these reasons, at disarmament conferences it has been able to put forward complete disarmament proposals, thus transgressing the code of the genteel diplomats.

It has concluded non-aggression pacts with its neighbors. By entering the League of Nations, the Soviet Union will be in an even better position to expose the war plans of the imperialist powers and to utilize their rivalries in order to postpone the armed conflicts that threaten Europe. By supporting the peace policies of the Soviet Union, student conferences have incurred the serious obligation of opposing the constant jingoist propaganda and the armed intervention which threaten the U.S.S.R.

Vital to the success of the anti-war movement is the revolt of the oppressed colonial peoples. Their uprisings have been leveled against foreign invasion and imperialist suppression. Their struggles for liberation assume great importance to us because they must be viewed as one of the major forces in the fight against imperialist war. Aiding these struggles by anti-war movements attacks the war-makers at a vulnerable point.

\* \* \*

In the foregoing discussion we have shown how modern war is fought for the conquest of new markets, for economic expansion. Clearly, then, the hypothetical question, "What will we do in case of a defensive war?" is entirely removed from reality. A defensive war, if it has any meaning at all, can simply be a defense of holdings previously grabbed by one group of financiers against another group. It is impossible to say that one is against war and still talk of defending one's country from invaders. As students who have lost our economic security and chance for employment we have little reason to defend the economic system which has shown itself opposed to our interests. The choice between the rule of one group of imperialists and another presents no dilemma. It becomes irrefutable that only the abolition of capitalism can solve the ultimate as well as immediate problems of the student body and the masses of people.

The world has never witnessed war preparations of such stupendous magnitude. A war has never been so imminent. Any signal may serve to set off a second world war. The Saar Basin which French and German imperialism have "amicably" settled is still a tender spot, or the Balkans, where a dozen European powers play for supremacy, may give the spark.

The hope of the anti-war movement lies in the organized strength and the organized opposition of the people who fight wars—primarily, of course, the industrial population.

#### R. O. T. C.

Together with the intensive activity of our militarists in every phase of life is the growth of military training in the schools. During the Civil War, the Merrill Land Grant Act was passed which specified the injection of military training into the curricula of all land grant colleges. By 1912, 57 institutions furnished military training.

In 1916, as one of the preliminaries to our entry in the World War, the National Defense Act, providing for the establishment of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the Citizens' Military Training Camps, was passed. As a result the number of institutions offering military training shot up from 57 to 115 during the first year, 1916; to 280 in 1927, to 313 in 1931. One hundred and fifty-nine schools, among them such "liberal" institutions as Cornell and Wisconsin (until 1926) had compulsory R.O.T.C. In 1933, 299 schools had military units, of which 156 were compulsory. The marked increase in the number of enrolled students has doubtless enchanted the bombastic occupants of the War Office in Washington:

1912	29,979	1931	147,009
1923	103,894	1933	117,013
1930	145,902		

During the ten-year period from 1921-1931 the federal government spent \$106,965,041 for R.O.T.C. alone. In 1932, \$6,000,000 was appropriated for R.O.T.C. and C.M.T.C., without including the pay of commissioned officers and enlisted men in charge of these activities.



Although juicy propositions are not altogether essential to induce universities and school boards to institute military training, still in most cases the War Department makes attractive gifts. Money-saving material equipment in the way of drill grounds, gymnasias, band instruments, horses, are promised. Expenses are further cut by supplanting the schools' necessary physical education and hygiene course with a more heroic activity. The War Department has also introduced a special rating system based on the presence of military facilities. This satisfies the universities' hunger for publicity; so, all in all, not a bad deal for the school administrations.

One of the seasonal clichés of the regular army officers who head the R.O.T.C. has been: "The R.O.T.C. builds men". Rot! In reality, the R.O.T.C. builds a war machine on the campus. Its body building claims are merely offered as a blind for its existence in the schools. Dr. Jesse F. Williams, former president of the American Physical Education Association, has said, "Military training in the colleges never has provided and in my opinion never can provide the kind of developmental activity essential to the organic development of young men".

The R.O.T.C. was created "for the purpose of providing a reserve of officers available for military service when needed".\* Its avowed purpose has not been too successfully achieved since there is a tremendous amount of waste. Of 103,894 students enrolled in 1924, only 3,317 became commissioned officers and 746 graduated with certificates. There are, however, compensating features. Along with the practical training must come also the dissemination of those ideas which will facilitate its most effective use. An important component of war preparedness is a relevant political orientation—practice and theory are inseparable. We quote here from the theory expressed in official manuals.

Jefferson notwithstanding, democracy is defined as "a government of the masses. . . . Results in mobocracy. . . . Results in demagogism, license, discontent, anarchy".\*\* Internationalism is

\* National Defense Act, 1916.

\*\* *Citizenship*, an official manual of the War Department.

succinctly described as "impractical and destructive idealism . . . being propagated by certain foreign agitators and is being echoed and reechoed by many of the nation's 'intellectuals' . . ." The problems of social legislation, of child labor, unemployment insurance and the like are curtly dismissed: "The problems of capital and labor, employer and employee, cannot be solved by unrepugnant methods. The suggestion of special legislation is socialistic and communistic and wholly repugnant to American character. . . ."

The instructor is told, "This inherent desire to fight and kill must be carefully watched for and encouraged. . . ."

Bits of technical information are inserted. In the manual of 1925 we read that, "To finish an opponent who hangs on or attempts to pull you to the ground, always try to break his hold by driving the knee or foot to his crotch and gouge his eyes out with your thumbs. . . ."

The 1926 Manual was recalled because of student protest, chiefly at the College of the City of New York. Some of the more sadistic bits were expunged. These changes were, of course, not changes in the policy of the War Department, but they do indicate the efficacy of student action.

For some time after the war, military training on the campus underwent a slump. The recent disaster was too fresh in the minds of the students, and militarism and jingoism were in bad taste. In 1922 at a conference of educators, social workers, and army officers the following seven-point scheme was contrived to make the R.O.T.C. more attractive.

1. Expensive, "chic" uniforms ranging from \$20 to \$30 to be given free. (Regular army uniforms cost about \$4.50.) Graduate students to receive, in addition, a cash subsistence of \$100 a year.
2. Summer camps—a government treat for students in the army division.
3. Summer cruises provided for students in the naval R.O.T.C.
4. Issuing polo ponies where they will do most good, for



"there are certain schools that would not have the R.O.T.C. were it not for the horses that are provided for the amusement of these young men".

5. Bands fully uniformed and equipped to add snap to college functions and games.

6. Prizes for competitions and sham battles.

7. Pretty girls to be appointed honorary officers.

The fight against the R.O.T.C. has often been misdirected in the past. Student objectors to militarism have allowed themselves to become entangled in non-essentials and have, as a consequence, won hollow victories. For example, student opinion was sharply raised in the case of a vicious manual and the manual was recalled. But the R.O.T.C. remained on the campus. The War Department can learn to do its work a little less obtrusively. It is quite satisfied to make such concessions so long as the R.O.T.C. is kept in the schools. Our campaign, then, must be directed against the R.O.T.C. as an institution. The recent decision of the Supreme Court sustaining the right of land grant colleges to have compulsory military training shows at once the necessity for such a campaign and the inadequacy of the feeble efforts of pacifist students.

The position of the Student League for Industrial Democracy on the R.O.T.C. exhibits a serious fallacy which has its origin in an erroneous analysis of the relation of the university to society. "This institution has no place in an academic community, especially when it is dedicated to a philosophy of peace." We trust that the material in this pamphlet will make it abundantly clear that the academic community is not devoted to a philosophy of peace. It is devoted to a philosophy of those who control it. The L.I.D. declaration completely separates the section on the R.O.T.C. from that on war. It fails to recognize that opposition to the R.O.T.C. can have meaning only as a fight against war and the forces that make for war.

From its beginning the N.S.L. has given clarity to the fight against the R.O.T.C. The N.S.L. demonstrated at the start that in order to abolish the R.O.T.C. it will be necessary to

win the support of students who are enrolled in the course. Our efforts are not aimed against students taking the R.O.T.C., our enemy is the institution. For this reason the N.S.L. members frequently enrolled in the R.O.T.C. so that the fight will be conducted from the inside as well as from the outside.

To those who have confined their protest to the compulsory feature of the R.O.T.C., and have argued, make the R.O.T.C. optional or elective, the National Student League has always answered, abolish the R.O.T.C. It is obnoxious because it is the tool of the War Department, because it is a part of the general propaganda for war. We have pointed to the propaganda character of the R.O.T.C. both for those who take the course and for those who do not. Its functions on the campus can be abolished only when it is eliminated from the campus.

#### The Trustees

It is common knowledge that the influence exercised by American educational institutions over the minds of their students and the teachings of their instructors represents the interests of the war-makers. This is especially apparent in the case of our colleges which, as we have seen, were turned into smooth-running war machines overnight.

Because they are private institutions, most colleges and universities depend upon the "generosity" of great bankers and industrialists for maintenance. Naturally, such "generosity" is contingent upon the political beliefs of the instructors, the type of textbook used, the efficiency with which the administration suppresses student movements running counter to the interests of the universities, benefactors, etc. The point of contact between finance capital and education may be found in an institution known generally as the Board of Trustees. Its membership is graced with such personages as captains of industry, bankers, the governmental puppets of big business, and adorned with an occasional minister or educator.

To illustrate the workings of the Board of Trustees we have selected a few examples.\*

\*Space limitations forbid including all the material at our disposal. Much of the material will be published in the near future by the N.S.L.



During the year 1934, seven students were expelled from Ohio State for refusing to take R.O.T.C. on religious grounds. Is it the official policy of Ohio State to smother so vehemently the anti-military sentiments of its students? In answer let us examine the composition of the Board of Trustees of Ohio State. Its prize trustee is Newton D. Baker, a corporation lawyer and Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of War. His life has been devoted to the cause of rallying all forces to the defense of capitalism. His behavior today does not indicate a change of heart. At the Brown Commencement, June 1934, he cried for more war preparedness. Baker has become head of a National Citizens' Committee which is preparing for "national defense" to meet any "emergency". A few of his connections are: director of the Cleveland Trust Co., of the Mutual Life Insurance Co., of the General Electric and General Motors (dominated by Morgan interests), of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, of the Radio Corporation of America, etc. In short, Mr. Newton D. Baker, a high class agent of Rockefeller and Morgan interests, symbolizes the endeavors of the capitalist world to extricate itself from the crisis by means of war. Among others on Ohio State's Board of Trustees is Edith Campbell, on the National Council of Defense during the World War and J. F. Stone head of a war-related metal combine. So at Ohio State objecting to militarism is highly conducive to abruptly terminating your academic career.

In 1934 Nazi Ambassador Luther was officially received at Columbia University. President Butler refused to endorse the student anti-war strike. Fascism was encouraged by President Butler's refusal to investigate Casa Italiana. Here are a few of the trustees of Columbia with their corporation affiliations.

Marcellus Hartley Dodge, Chairman of the Board of Remington Arms, which produces one third of U. S. war armaments, sits with Percy Rockefeller on the Board of Directors of Bethlehem Steel. Joseph P. Grace of the Grace Nitrate Co. busy transporting war materials from Chile to the U. S., is a director in Grace National and National City Bank. David F. Houston,

a friend of the late Richard Mellon, and a colleague of J. P. Morgan, is on the board of the First National Bank. Clarence M. Wooley meets with the duPonts, Junius Morgan, and Jacob Raskob (a Morgan lieutenant) on the Board of General Motors.

We give a few more correlations between trustees' affiliations and university policies.

On May Day, 1934, a group of University of Michigan students journeyed from Ann Arbor to Detroit to participate in the May Day parade of Detroit workers and intellectuals. These students were brutally attacked by Detroit police. The University authorities expressed no indignation at the vicious treatment meted out to their students. Rather, it was plainly hinted that disciplinary action was forthcoming. This incident is consistent with the fact that every prominent Regent of the University of Michigan including Murfin, Bodman, Dwight Douglas, Bennet, and Shields is connected with the automobile industry in one way or another.

During the week of July 15, 1934, the administration of the University of Chicago issued a case against the N.S.L. warning the League that if it continued to fight against Negro discrimination and Jim-Crowism, its charter would be revoked. The decree was not the impartial judgment of an Olympian educational institution. The administration's order plainly bore the rubber stamp of U.S. Steel, Swift and Armour, and Standard Oil, who value Jim-Crowism as an aid to strike-breaking.

The University of Pennsylvania fired Scott Nearing for daring to attack Billy Sunday, an invited speaker. Pennsylvania was called by Upton Sinclair\* "the University of United Gas Improvements", because so many directors of the Morgan-controlled 841 million dollar utility combine were trustees of the U. of P. Sinclair in this regard has not been outdated, for the set of trustees which held the reins in 1923 are practically the same in 1935. U. of P.'s stand on an anti-war strike can be safely predicted by a glance at its list of directors.

\* Upton Sinclair, *The Goose Step*.  
23



In the fall of 1934, following upon the club's leading a campaign for the abolition of the R.O.T.C., the N.S.L. chapter at the University of California was banned by a university act. A few months later five students were expelled from the University of California at Los Angeles by Provost Moore on the ground that they were involved in a plot to destroy the university. The sinister plot amounted to a signed petition for a student-controlled forum. The editor of the Santa Clara Weekly was expelled from Santa Clara College because he "refused to print what the faculty wanted him to" and because he wrote that "students have nothing to gain by war". Subsequently he was refused admittance to the University of California.

President Sproul of the University of California and his Board of Regents will not brook interference with war preparations on the campus. On the Board of Regents there is J. C. Neylan, chief counsel for the San Francisco Examiner (Hearst) and also chief organizer of the red-baiting campaign that helped break the West Coast general strike of the summer of 1934; Mortimer Fleischacker, chairman of the Board of the Anglo-California National Bank; William H. Crocker, President of the First National Bank and a director of the Pacific Gas and Electric Co.; Chester Rowell, Editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, engaged in open fascist propaganda; and others.

Students need not speculate about the action school administrations will take in the next war. They belong too completely to the war-profiters to do other than to support them.

Thus a new aspect of the fight against war emerges—to combat the suppressive measures stimulated by trustees' domination. In so doing, we carry the anti-war offensive into the camp of the war-makers. Situations will unquestionably arise where the student body can successfully campaign for the ousting of a trustee whose affiliations are blatant and whose contributions dictate university policies so contrary to the interests of students that his expulsion would constitute a genuine victory. Yet we cannot hope to gain our end by demanding the abolition of the Board of Trustees. The slogan is vaporous. If this were the



battering ram of our fight against war, we should be weaponless. The present function of the Board of Trustees could easily be undertaken by another agency. We have learned that there is no easy way out. Capitalist society is too firmly entrenched in all fields of life to enable us to pluck its influence from one alone. Education cannot remain pure while the rest of the world is unchaste.

The fight against war can only be effective when the majority of students are organized on the basis of a militant program which takes into account specific daily needs, when students ally themselves to that class which is equipped to lead the struggle against war, the working class.

### Student Action Against War

Upon a clear understanding of the nature of the society which produces war rests the efficacy of our anti-war movement. Without a recognition of the economic forces that drive capitalist countries to war, there can be no drastic break with the conventional methods employed by pacifist organizations and there can be no adequate strategy planned to oppose war. Once it is granted that the underlying cause of war resides in finance-capital's seeking continuous expansion and increased profits, the conclusions are obvious. We cannot rely on diplomats. We cannot trust to peace pacts. We must be ever suspicious of the official peace machinery such as the League of Nations. We must unite with all sections of the population who oppose imperialist war. We must take a stand against the system that breeds war.

Our action in the time of war will be dictated in a large part by the perspective we develop now. The trend of the anti-war movement is away from pacifism, away from the ineffectual heroism of individual action. We have seen that war cannot be exorcized by an exemplary life. To twist the word non-support in the Oxford Pledge to non-participation is actually to change the direction of our whole movement. Until now we have taken broad, organized actions against the war-makers. Surely on the



day that war breaks out we will not make an about face. We will not decide that the brief heroism of a few can triumph over the frenzied forces of capitalism jockeyed up by war. The anti-war movement must then redouble its efforts to spread and organize war opposition.

An examination of the past student actions against war will indicate the direction we have taken.

The first step toward coordinating the student anti-war movement on a national scale was taken at the Student Anti-War Congress, held in Chicago, December 1932. The Chicago Congress was called by the World Congress Against War and Fascism at Amsterdam in September, 24, of the same year. Several months before, the National Student League held its first national convention in April 1932. The unification of militant students into one national body presaged a new era for the American campus. It was largely due to the initiative of the National Student League that over 600 delegates from nearly every state in the union and every sort of political belief met in Chicago.

The program of the Chicago Student Congress declared its purpose to be the formulation of a plan of student struggle against imperialist war. It proclaimed capitalism to be the cause of war. It provided that anti-war committees be elected in each school for the prosecution of the united front against war. The Congress proposed a national campaign to be conducted against the R.O.T.C. together with mass anti-war demonstrations.

The resolutions stressed above all else that the workers were the most effective force in the anti-war movement; students, it added, must support the working class and follow its lead.

The pacifist delegates accepted this program. They were determined not to further waste their energies by trying to fight imperialist war via "The Angels of Peace". They agreed the Congress had adopted a minimum program, excluding no group.

During the year following the Congress there were frequent local actions against war and military training. Students were expelled from the University of Maryland and from the Uni-

versity of California for religious objection to the R.O.T.C. The University of Ohio expelled seven conscientious objectors to military training. The seven students were unwilling to undertake a mass fight for the abolition of the R.O.T.C. and for their own reinstatement. They raised a fund to go off to some other university. In all three cases the N.S.L. supported the expelled students, and at the same time pointed out that so long as they considered R.O.T.C. a matter of personal objection they were obscuring the real issues involved. At City College where perpetual expulsions reign, twenty-one students were expelled for leading a demonstration against Jingo-Day, when the annual military parade was held at the College. Although the students were not reinstated, the case was fought as an anti-war issue and student opinion was rallied to their defense. There was manifested at City College militancy and support that was lacking in the previous cases.

By the Fall of 1933 a new and decisive weapon was contributed to the student struggle against war in the form of the local campus anti-war conference. These conferences were able to involve great numbers of students even in the most isolated universities and college. There was hardly a single conference that did not follow the main programmatic line of the Chicago Student Congress. Everywhere N.S.L. Chapters were active participants in the preparations and proceedings. More than half the conferences affiliated to the American League Against War and Fascism. In this way the local conferences were linked to the nation-wide movement. The conferences have been engaged in strenuous activity. They have mobilized the students for demonstrations. They published bulletins. They have distributed anti-war literature. They have become an important factor in campus life throughout the country. The conferences laid the ground for the nation-wide anti-war strike in April, 1934.

The entire week from April 6 to 13 had been popularized as student anti-war week, in fitting commemoration of America's entrance into the World War. There were preparatory demon-



strations on April 6. In New York several hundred students laid a wreath on the monument of the eternal light and took the Oxford Pledge.

About twenty-five thousand students took part in the strike. In New York City alone there were fifteen thousand students out on strike. Brooklyn College had four thousand students of a total enrollment of five thousand in a parade subsequent mass meeting. There were practically no classes in session: no scabbing because the Association of Instructors and Tutors had voted to support the strike. At City College where many students had been suspended and expelled for similar demonstrations fifteen hundred students defied the strike ban. In spite of elaborate threats the disciplinary action taken was the reprimand of the strike leader. This was popularly considered as a joke in the light of past history.

The strike in New York City was distinguished by evidence of the progress of anti-war expression in the high schools. In New Lots Evening High School where the strike was conducted on the night of April 12, eleven hundred striking students and an equal number of workers who later came to their assistance were attacked by several emergency squads and police. At



Police attacking students of the City College of New York who demonstrated and called a one-hour strike against war on April 13, 1934.

De Witt Clinton the administration took forcible measures to prevent the strike. One of the leaders was locked up in an empty room by several members of the football squad. Over two thousand students who gathered in the huge lunchroom found that all exits had been locked in order to prevent them from going out on strike. This did not hinder them. The lunchroom was converted into a strike hall. There were speeches and cheers mingled with cries of indignation at the actions taken by the administration.

At Johns Hopkins University the strike was carried off with flying colors. Although classes begin on the half hour at Hopkins several classes left their classrooms at eleven sharp. The entire sophomore history class walked out. The attempt by some R.O.T.C. students to disrupt their meeting merely succeeded in consolidating the campus anti-war sentiment. Syracuse University in spite of the administration's ban on all publicity found that three hundred students came out on strike.

At the University of Southern California, previously noted for its football teams, the administration was forced to grant the students the school auditorium for the strike meeting. In conservative New England the strikes had considerable success. At Amherst students left their classes and marched to the Massachusetts State campus. At Clark University the strike was one hundred per cent effective, the professors participating and no classes in session. The most serious opposition was met with only at Harvard where a group of fascist students, dressed in boy scout uniforms and night gowns, carried banners denouncing peace and the National Student League.

The April 13 strike was conducted jointly by the National Student League and the Student League for Industrial Democracy. These two organizations also cooperated in a series of Armistice day activities November 9 to 11, 1934. Regional conferences were instituted. Among the latter events was an anti-war conference in Baltimore which attracted many new schools. The University of North Carolina had nearly the entire student body represented at a conference. In Newark several hundred



high school students fought their way out of the school buildings to join striking students from Dana College.

Perhaps the most far-reaching event in the student anti-war field was the International Student Congress Against War and Fascism held at Brussels, December 29 to 31, 1934. Hundreds of students were assembled representing all countries of the world and all shades of anti-war opinion. The main concern of the Congress was to unify the student anti-war movement the world over. One of its major tasks was the preparation of a world wide anti-war strike for April 12, 1935. The International Socialist Student Congress has already declared itself in favor of a struggle for that date. Although the I.S.S.C. took no stand on the International Student Congress many of its larger national sections participated; among them, the French movement and the American affiliate, the S.L.I.D.

The program formulated by the International Congress was sweeping and distinctive. It set itself against retrenchment in education, against fascism and the destruction of culture and progress, "against the militarization of youth . . . against militarization of sport, against chauvinist propaganda". It denounced "publicly the use of laboratories to prepare for the war of tomorrow by research in aviation, chemistry, bacteriology, and other fields". Finally, it proceeded to integrate the student anti-war movements of all the nations represented.

The problem of relating the student movement to the main stream of anti-war action is crucial. Unless such coordination is achieved, we are in grave danger of missing the wider implications of the various issues that arise, and on this account check our forward march. It is precisely for this reason that the N.S.L. has constantly supported the American League Against War and Fascism in all its activities. The N.S.L. has always urged anti-war conferences to affiliate to the American League because it is the only organization to unite groups of diverse political alignment and of differing social composition against imperialistic war. The fact that the American League is rooting itself more in the working class makes our cooperation imperative.

As the student anti-war movement gathers strength many participants feel the need for a campus organization whose program is more inclusive. They become impressed with the ramifications of the anti-war fight. As the external world presses harder on the student the issues he meets on the campus grow more distinct and their connections more demonstrable. Thus they find an array of such issues as trustee domination, increased tuition fees, military training on the campus, expulsion of militant students and instructors, abrogation of student's rights, etc., all interrelated. They discover that what appears to be an attack by the administration upon the students' organization fighting for students' rights is indeed an offensive carried on against the entire student body. To students who sincerely oppose war the National Student League offers a definite program. To students who seek an organization to give expression to their needs, the N.S.L. is their organization.

During the two years of its existence the N.S.L. has made rapid strides forward. It is gaining a vast influence in the high schools where intensive organization is a requisite for building a powerful student movement.

The N.S.L. is playing a leading role on the American campus today. It is reaching out to the broad sections of the student body for support of the anti-war movement. The future of the American student, the future of the student anti-war movement is inextricably bound up with the progress of the National Student League.

---

Issued March, 1935, by the National Executive Committee of the NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE, 31 East 27th Street, New York City.



*Enroll in the Student Front*  
*Against War and Fascism—Join the*  
**NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE**

I wish to become a member of the National Student League.

Name .....

Address .....

School .....

Send this to the National Office of the National Student League, Room 84, 31 East 27th Street, New York City, together with the registration fee of ten cents for high school students and 25 cents for college students.

*Read the*  
**STUDENT REVIEW**

Published by the National Student League

..... *Use This Blank* .....

Student Review,  
Room 84,  
31 East 27th Street,  
New York, N. Y.

I wish to become a subscriber to *Student Review*. I enclose 35 cents for eight issues.

Name .....

Address .....

School .....